

REMARKS

At the outset, the Applicant thanks the Examiner for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated March 17, 2008 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Claims 1 and 8 are hereby amended to correct minor typographical errors. Claim 15 is hereby added. No new matter has been added. Accordingly, claims 1-15 are currently pending. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 1 and 4-6 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 3,946,500 to *Barrett et al.* (hereinafter "*Barrett*"). The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

As required in Chapter 2131 of the M.P.E.P., in order to anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. §102, "the reference must teach every element of the claim." The Applicant respectfully submits that *Barrett* does not teach every element recited in claims 1 and 4-6 and therefore cannot anticipate these claims. More specifically, independent claim 1 recites a drum assembly of a laundry dryer which includes, among other features, "a main head rim being coupled to a first end of the drum main body and provided with a plurality of elevated portions and a support sleeve bent from an end of the main head rim." *Barrett* fails to disclose at least this feature.

The Office Action alleges that column 2, lines 1-51 anticipates this feature. *See page 2 of the Office Action.* The Applicant respectfully disagrees. The Office Action fails to particularly point out which element is being relied upon. Under 37 C.F.R. 1.104, the particular part of *Barrett* relied on to anticipate the claimed invention must be identified and the pertinence of the reference must be clearly explained. Identifying an entire column of text does not satisfy this

requirement. Thus, the rejection is improper and should be withdrawn because the Office Action fails to meet the requirements of 37 C.F.R. 1.104.

Nevertheless, the Applicant has carefully reviewed the entire disclosure of *Barrett* and has found nothing that could be construed to anticipate this feature. Rather, *Barrett* discloses a drum including a wrapper 6 and a front pressing 4 having a circular shape. See *Figure 3 and column 2, lines 11-14*. Further, *Barrett* discloses that the front pressing 4 has “a circular shape with a raised flange 5 located round its periphery.” *Column 2, lines 12-13*. Even if, assuming *arguendo*, the Examiner is relying on front pressing 4 to anticipate “a main head rim” and raised flange 5 to anticipate an elevated portion, raised flange 5 is only a single portion not “a plurality of elevated portions,” as recited in claim 1. In fact, *Barrett* fails to disclose any structure that could be construed as the claimed “plurality of elevated portions.” Accordingly, *Barrett* fails to anticipate the claimed invention because the reference fails to teach each and every feature recited in claim 1.

For at least the aforementioned reason, the Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over *Barrett*. Likewise, claims 4-6, which depend from claim 1 are also patentable for at least the same reason. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejection of claims 1 and 4-6 over *Barrett* be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejects claims 8-10 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 1,169,782 to *Eden* (hereinafter “*Eden*”). The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

The Applicant respectfully submits that *Eden* does not teach every element recited in claims 8-10 and 13 and therefore cannot anticipate these claims. More specifically, independent

claim 8 recites a drum assembly of a laundry dryer which includes, among other features, “a lift mounted on an inner circumference of the drum main body and provided at a bottom surface with a positioning projection inserted in the coupling hole.” *Eden* fails to disclose at least this feature.

The Office Action relies on reference number 10 to anticipate the claimed “lift” and reference number 14 to anticipate the “positioning projection.” *See page 3 of the Office Action.* However, *Eden* discloses that longitudinal ribs 10 and retaining battens 14 are two separate and distinct elements. *See Figure 4 and page 1, lines 93-96.* Moreover, *Eden* fails to disclose that any portion of the retaining batten 14 is “inserted in the coupling hole” in a cylindrical drum main body, as required by the claims. Therefore, since nothing in *Eden* could possibly be construed as “a lift...with a positioning projection inserted in the coupling hole,” as recited in claim 8, the reference cannot anticipate the claimed invention.

For at least the aforementioned reason, the Applicant respectfully submits that claim 8 is patentably distinguishable over *Eden*. Likewise, claims 9, 10 and 13, which depend from claim 8 are also patentable for at least the same reason. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejection of claims 8-10 and 13 over *Eden* be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejects claims 2, 3 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Berrett*. The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

As required in Chapter 2143.03 of the M.P.E.P., in order to “establish *prima facie* obviousness of the claimed invention, all the limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art.” As previously discussed, *Berrett* fails to teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 1, the independent claim from which claims 2, 3 and 7 depend. Moreover, the alleged modification

of *Berrett* fails to address the previously noted shortcomings of *Berrett*, namely “a main head rim being coupled to a first end of the drum main body and provided with a plurality of elevated portions and a support sleeve bent from an end of the main head rim.” In fact, the alleged modification of *Berrett* is only relied upon for its purported disclosure of a “forming process, welding portion, and head wall seam-weld.” *Office Action at page 4*. Thus, even if one skilled in the art were to contemplate modifying *Berrett* as suggested, the modification would still fail to teach or suggest each and every feature recited in claim 1. Since neither the reference nor the reference as allegedly modified teach or suggest each and every feature recited in claim 1, the teaching of *Berrett* does not render the claimed invention obvious. Therefore, the Applicant submits that claims 2, 3 and 7 are patentably distinguishable over *Berrett* and requests that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejects claims 11, 12 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Eden*. The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

As previously discussed, *Eden* fails to teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 8, the independent claim from which claims 11, 12 and 14 depend. Moreover, the alleged modification of *Eden* fails to address the previously noted shortcomings of *Eden*, namely “a lift mounted on an inner circumference of the drum main body and provided at a bottom surface with a positioning projection inserted in the coupling hole.” In fact, the alleged modification of *Eden* is only relied upon for its purported disclosure of a “claimed hole depth or location and coupling member location.” *Office Action at page 4*. Thus, even if one skilled in the art were to contemplate modifying *Eden* as suggested, the modification would still fail to teach or suggest each and every feature recited in claim 8. Since neither the reference nor the reference as allegedly modified teach or suggest each and every feature recited in claim 8, the teaching of

Eden does not render the claimed invention obvious. Therefore, the Applicant submits that claims 11, 12 and 14 are patentably distinguishable over *Eden* and requests that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection be withdrawn.

The Office Action also rejects claims 1-14 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-10 of U.S. Patent No. 7,340,849 (hereinafter “the ‘849 patent”). The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claims 1-14 are not obvious in view of claims 1-11 of the ‘849 patent because they are not coextensive in scope. More specifically, as previously discussed, claim 1 recites a drum assembly of a laundry dryer which includes, among other features, “a main head rim being coupled to a first end of the drum main body and provided with a plurality of elevated portions and a support sleeve bent from an end of the main head rim.” Claim 8 recites a drum assembly of a laundry dryer which includes, among other features, “a lift mounted on an inner circumference of the drum main body and provided at a bottom surface with a positioning projection inserted in the coupling hole.” The Applicant submits that the ‘849 patent does not claim these features. In fact, rather than address these features, the Office Action merely alleges that “it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to recite the claimed seam weld process.” Absent a claim of at least the above features, claims 1-10 of the ‘849 patent are patentably distinct from the instant claimed invention. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests that the obviousness-type double patenting rejection of claims 1-14 over claims 1-10 of the ‘849 patent be withdrawn.

Likewise, newly added claim 15 is also patentably distinguishable over the cited references for at least the aforementioned reasons.

The application is in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited. If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: June 13, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By


Mark R. Kresloff

Registration No.: 42,766

McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP

1900 K Street, N.W.

Washington, DC 20006

(202) 496-7500

Attorneys for Applicant